

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 15, and 16 each have been amended to incorporate the elements of Claim 6 and part of the elements of Claim 8, and to further specify the ferrite core configurations. Support can be found in Claims 4-6 and 11, as will as Fig. 4, illustrating as an embodiment that a ferrite core 67 is smaller than a ferrite core 59, and a copper tube 60 is smaller in diameter than a copper tube 68, 69, for example. Claim 6 has been canceled. Claims 7 and 8 have been amended to conform to the amendments to Claim 1. Claims 4-6 and 11 have been canceled. No new matter has been added or no new issue has been raised. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

### Rejection of Claims 1-6, 9, 14-17, 28, 29 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6, 9, 14-17, 28, 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakoshi et al (US 6,456,010) in view of Murata et al (US 6,363,881) and Ito et al (US 5,935,374).

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the elements of Claim 6 and part of the elements of Claim 8, and to further specify the ferrite core configurations. Claims 4-6 have been canceled.

None of Yamakoshi et a, Murata et al, and Ito et al teaches or suggests in any predictable manner: “each branch comprises a hollow copper tube as an inductor, [and] each inductance adjuster is a ferrite core which removably encircles the hollow copper tube to adjust an impedance value of the transmission system” as defined in Claim 1 as amended herein.

Further, none of Yamakoshi et a, Murata et al, and Ito et al teaches or suggests in any predictable manner: “the hollow copper tube of the second branching is smaller in diameter than the hollow copper tube of the first branching, and the ferrite core encircling the hollow copper tube of the second branching is smaller than the ferrite core encircling the hollow copper tube of the first branching” as defined in Claim 1 as amended herein. Due to the above structural features, fine adjustment of the characteristic impedance value of each branch connected to the multiple supply points can easily and effectively be accomplished.

**Application No.: 10/807,528**  
**Filing Date: March 23, 2004**

Therefore, Claim 1 could not be obvious over Yamakoshi et al, Murata et al, and Ito et al. Claims 15 and 16 have been amended in a manner substantially similar to Claim 1, and thus Claims 15 and 16 also could not be obvious over Yamakoshi et al, Murata et al, and Ito et al. It is respectfully requested that the rejections of Claims 1, 15, and 16 be withdrawn, and it is also respectfully requested that the rejections of Claims 2-3, 9, 14, 17, 28, and 29 be withdrawn at least due to their dependencies upon Claims 1, 15, or 16.

Rejection of Claim 7 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakoshi et al in view of Murata et al and Ito et al and further in view of Blonigan (US 2002/0046989).

As discussed above in relation to Claim 1, Claim 1 could not be obvious over Yamakoshi et al in view of Murata et al and Ito et al. Blonigan does not supply the deficiencies of the above references. Therefore, Claim 1 could not be obvious over Yamakoshi et al in view of Murata et al and Ito et al and further in view of Blonigan. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 7 be withdrawn at least due to its dependency upon Claim 1.

Rejection of Claim 8 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakoshi et al in view of Murata et al and Ito et al and further in view of McGaffigan (US 5,182,427).

As discussed above in relation to Claim 1, Claim 1 could not be obvious over Yamakoshi et al in view of Murata et al and Ito et al. McGaffigan discloses a copper wire and ferrite beads. However, McGaffigan does not teach or suggest in any predictable manner: “the hollow copper tube of the second branching is smaller in diameter than the hollow copper tube of the first branching, and the ferrite core encircling the hollow copper tube of the second branching is smaller than the ferrite core encircling the hollow copper tube of the first branching” as defined in Claim 1 as amended herein.

Therefore, Claim 1 could not be obvious over Yamakoshi et al in view of Murata et al and Ito et al and further in view of McGaffigan. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 8 be withdrawn at least due to its dependency upon Claim 1.

**Application No.: 10/807,528**  
**Filing Date: March 23, 2004**

Rejections of Claims 10, 30 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10, 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakoshi et al in view of Murata et al and Ito et al and further in view of Tomoyasu (US 7,153,387).

As discussed above in relation to Claim 1, Claim 1 could not be obvious over Yamakoshi et al in view of Murata et al and Ito et al. Tomoyasu does not supply the deficiencies of the above references. Therefore, Claim 1 could not be obvious over Yamakoshi et al in view of Murata et al and Ito et al and further in view of Tomoyasu. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 10, 30 be withdrawn at least due to its dependency upon Claim 1.

Rejections of Claim 11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakoshi et al in view of Murata et al, Ito et al, and Blonigan et al, and further in view of McGaffigan.

As discussed above in relation to Claim 7, Claim 7 could not be obvious over Yamakoshi et al in view of Murata et al, Ito et al, and Blonigan et al. McGaffigan does not supply the deficiencies of the above references.

However in view of cancelation of Claim 11, Applicants submit that the rejtction of this claim is moot.

Rejection of Claims 12, 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 12 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakoshi et al in view of Murata and Ito and further in view of DeOrnellas et al (US 6,190,496).

As discussed above in relation to Claim 1, Claim 1 could not be obvious over Yamakoshi et al in view of Murata et al and Ito et al. DeOrnellas et al does not supply the deficiencies of the above references. Therefore, Claim 1 could not be obvious over Yamakoshi et al in view of Murata et al and Ito et al and further in view of DeOrnellas et al. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 12, 13 be withdrawn at least due to its dependency upon Claim 1.

**Application No.: 10/807,528**  
**Filing Date: March 23, 2004**

Rejection of Claims 31, 32 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 31, 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakoshi et al in view of Murata and Ito and further in view of Brunner (US 3,995,237).

As discussed above in relation to Claim 1, Claim 1 could not be obvious over Yamakoshi et al in view of Murata et al and Ito et al. Brunner does not supply the deficiencies of the above references. Therefore, Claim 1 could not be obvious over Yamakoshi et al in view of Murata et al and Ito et al and further in view of Brunner. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 31, 32 be withdrawn at least due to its dependency upon Claim 1.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the Applicant's amendments to the claims and the foregoing Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. The grounds for rejection which are not discussed herein are moot and Applicants expressly do not acquiesce in the findings not separately addressed. Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns which might prevent the prompt allowance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below.

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, the Applicants are not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. The Applicants reserve the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that the Applicants have made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

**Application No.: 10/807,528**  
**Filing Date: March 23, 2004**

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: December 8, 2008

By: Adeel S. Akhtar  
Adeel S. Akhtar  
Registration No. 41,394  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(415) 954-4114

6334529\_1  
120808